

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Secondary Student Success Center 803



2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide
Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 12 |
| R.A.I.S.E | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 18 |

Secondary Student Success Center 803

18180 SW 122ND AVE, Miami, FL 33177

outreach.dadeschools.net

Demographics

Principal: Alberto Iber

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| 2021-22 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Function (per accountability file) | |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 6-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Alternative Education |
| 2021-22 Title I School | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating | 2023-24: No Rating |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade County School Board.

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Foster relationships with community partners in order to provide wrap-around services to successfully meet the diverse needs of Educational Alternative Outreach Program (EAOP) students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We strive to foster relationships with community partners through innovation, opportunity and access to assist with eradicating the school to jail house pipeline, which is prevalent in our communities.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

The Secondary Student Success Center (S3C) at Robert Morgan Technical Center and Technical College is an Alternative School that provides dropout prevention and academic intervention services for over-age middle grades students in grades 6-8. The curriculum is delivered through a technology-based program that provides an individual program of study for each student to complete middle school courses. Student subgroup information is representative of 31% Black, 67% Hispanic, 12% White, 13% is ESE, and 1% of the student population being ELL inclusive of levels 2-3.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Iber, Alberto | Principal | Provide instructional leadership to faculty and staff to promote academic excellence, foster collaboration to support a positive school climate, and coordinate all school resources to ensure all stakeholders are equipped with the means to deliver quality educational programs to our students. |
| Hope, Tarvaneisha | Assistant Principal | Assist the Principal with providing instructional leadership to faculty and staff, promote academic excellence, foster collaboration to support a positive school climate, and coordinate all school resources to ensure all stakeholders are equipped with the means to deliver quality educational programs to our students. |
| Lopez-Perez, Vivienne | Staffing Specialist | Serves as the Local Education Agency (LEA) representative for the school. |
| Cabell, Ben | Attendance/Social Work | Provide comprehensive school social work services to parents, students and school staff, addressing barriers that limit a student from receiving full benefit from their educational experience. The school social worker will also address attendance concerns and respond to referrals from school administration, teachers, and others by providing direct services and by assisting families in accessing appropriate community resources. |
| Perez de Ayllon, Nidia | ELL Compliance Specialist | Serves as the ELL representative for the school. |
| Townslly, Marshonda | School Counselor | Provides a comprehensive school-counseling program that assists all students in acquiring the skills and knowledge to maximize highest student achievement. Also, counsels students to fully develop each student's academic, career, personal, and social abilities; and make referrals as appropriate in consultation with the student's parent or guardian. |
| Waters, Sabrina | SAC Member | The EESAC's function is to bring together all stakeholders and involve them in an authentic role in decisions which affect instruction and the delivery of programs. |
| Jones, Latonya | Math Coach | The Instructional Mathematics Coach will assist with the coordination and implementation of the Comprehensive Mathematics Plan and Florida's Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) Standards for Mathematics. The Coaching model (planning, demonstrating, providing |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---|
| | | feedback) with teachers at the school site to facilitate the successful implementation of research-based reading instruction. |
| Gonzalez, Alejandro | Instructional Technology | The school's information technology specialist coordinates, organizes, and facilitates the effective utilization of administrative and instructional technology and administrative applications within the total school environment to enhance student achievement. |
| | Reading Coach | The Instructional Reaching Coach will assist with the coordination and implementation of the Comprehensive Reading Plan and Florida's Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) are standards for English Language Arts (ELA). The Coaching Model (planning, demonstrating, providing feedback) will be utilized with teachers at the school site to facilitate the successful implementation of research-based reading instruction. |

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

N/A

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Alberto Iber

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

39

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

3

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

3

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

0

Number of teachers with ESE certification?

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

0

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

0

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 3/31/2023

2021-22 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|--|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | 54% | 51% | | | | | 59% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | | | | 54% | 51% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | 48% | 42% |
| Math Achievement | | 42% | 38% | | | | | 54% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | | | | 52% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | 51% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | 41% | 40% | | | | | 68% | 68% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | 56% | 48% | | | | | 76% | 73% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 58% | -58% | 54% | -54% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 6% | 56% | -50% | 52% | -46% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 60% | -60% | 56% | -56% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -6% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 58% | -58% | 55% | -55% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 18% | 53% | -35% | 54% | -36% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 8% | 40% | -32% | 46% | -38% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -18% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 08 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 0% | 43% | -43% | 48% | -48% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 19% | 73% | -54% | 71% | -52% |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2022 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 9 | 18 | | 18 | 45 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 9 | 13 | | 14 | 33 | | | 18 | | | |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | N/A |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | |
| Percent Tested | |
| Subgroup Data | |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?

According to the 2022 FSA data student Learning Gains in math increased 32 to 42 percentage points representing a 10 percentage points. ELA decreased from 17 to 14 percentage points which represents a decrease of 3 percentage points Progress monitoring tools in place in both areas were i-Ready Diagnostic Test AP1 in Fall, AP2 in winter, i-Ready weekly data reports, district writing assessment, course work assessments, coaching model, differentiated instruction, and small group instruction contributed to this improved score.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The most improvement was Math gains. An improvement of 10 percentage points was achieved in this area from 32-42 percentage points in during the 2022 FSA assessment. During the year new actions were implemented to assist teachers with data disaggregation, and data chats were held with teachers, students, and administration to help plan for effective instruction.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

The greatest need of improvement is increasing the percentage of student participation during the 2023 FAST PM3 Reading assessment. This area is problematic because during 2022 FSA assessments Learning Gains in ELA decreased 3 percentage points from 17 to 14 percentage points. To increase learning gains and academic achievement bi-weekly progress monitoring, small group, and an intervention plan. Administrators, Reading Coach, and teachers will continue to monitor student performance and respond systematically and continually to instruction and intervention. These data-driven models will ensure that students adequately progress.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Trends that emerge based on FSA and i-Ready monitoring data, are students have difficulty in answering multiple part questions and they struggle with comprehension and the integration of ideas. In

Math, students are behind their peers academically and historically particularly in solving mathematics questions involving word problems.

What strategies need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Students experience substantial academic difficulties, as most students are 2 to 3 years behind their academic peers. To improve learning outcomes, small group/individualized instruction, checks for understanding; data-driven instruction (i-Ready) and ongoing progress monitoring will be used to accelerate learning. Additionally, providing students with one-on-one tutoring (as some students require even more intensive, individualized instruction) implemented with fidelity.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development opportunities for teachers and leaders will include i-Ready, the new state testing platform Florida Assessment of Student (FAST), trainings to help address historic academic gaps, and effective utilization of Progress Monitoring Data Review (PMDR).

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on the FSA Spring 2022 data, student learning gains in ELA decreased by 3 percentage points and demonstrate a need for improved instructional practices and strategies to increase learning gains and academic achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

To improve the percentage of students making ELA learning gains from 14 - 24 percentage points during the FAST PM3 Reading Assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

On-going progress monitoring will occur by school administrators and instructional Reading Coach. Including data disaggregation and data chats with teachers to drive instructional decisions, walkthroughs, teacher feedback, collaborative conversations, data chats, and examining student work folder to ensure sustainable results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alberto Iber (albertoiber@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The Reaching Coach will share best practice strategies with ELA teachers to implement with students to increase student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Support will be provided to teachers to aid with infusing standards-based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will conduct data chats with students after classroom and district-based assessments to empower students to track their academic performance and growth.

Person Responsible

Alberto Iber (albertoiber@dadeschools.net)

Instructional coaches will conduct a professional development session on data collection and is disaggregation, and progress monitoring techniques.

Person Responsible

Alberto Iber (albertoiber@dadeschools.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on the FSA Spring 2022 data, we will increase the percentage of students making learning gains in math from 42 percentage points to 52 percentage points to demonstrate student growth on the FAST PM3 Math assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

To improve the percentage of students making Mathh learning gains from 4 to -52 percentae points during the FAST PM3 Math assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

On-going progress monitoring will occur by school administrators and Math Coach. Including data disaggregation and data chats with teachers to drive instructional decisions, walkthroughs, teacher feedback, collaborative conversations, data chats, and examining student work folder to ensure sustainable results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alberto Iber (albertoiber@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Evidence based strategies utilized to increase student achievement and support classroom teachers and math interventionist include using B.E.S.T standards for mathematics, the coaching cycle, and best practices in mathematics instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The selected strategies and resources align with state standards and have proven to be effective.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will conduct data chats with students after classroom and district-based assessments to empower students to track their academic performance and growth.

Person Responsible

Alberto Iber (albertoiber@dadeschools.net)

Administration will meet with teachers and instructional coaches to analyze assessment data, discuss classroom observations and review coaching support logs to ensure a clear alignment with instructional support to the implementation of data chats and progress being made toward the improvement of student achievement.

Person Responsible

Alberto Iber (albertoiber@dadeschools.net)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

N/A

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.

Other

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

Data will be collected and analyzed in throughout the school year as evidenced by sign in sheets, verbal feedback, survey, data reports...etc. to gauge the effectiveness of Positive Culture and Environment initiatives. Some meetings and activities to involve all stakeholders are as follows:

- Conduct parent/student interviews during registration
- Facilitate Title I Annual Meeting/Open House
- Collaborate the development of School Compacts and PFEP plans with parents' input
- Host EESAC meetings
- Provide Parent Resource Center
- Communicate with parents regularly
- Provide student monthly progress report
- Provide parents with option of receiving weekly progress report by email
- Invite parents/stakeholders to Parent Academy workshops
- School Climate Survey
- Discipline Data
- Truancy Meetings
- Counseling Logs
- Career and Education Planning

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

Information will be communicated at the Opening of School Meeting, EESAC meetings, student orientations, faculty meetings, Annual Title I Meeting, Connect-Ed, truancy meetings, public notices, letters, and flyers.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

Quarterly

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|---|
| Conduct meetings and activities with stakeholders (students, parents, staff, community members) throughout school year. Items will be reviewed quarterly by key individuals. | Iber, Alberto, albertoiber@dadeschools.net |